DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 296 FL 027 128

AUTHOR Gogolin, Ingrid; Reich, Hans
TITLE Immigrant Languages in Federal Germany.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 25p.; In: The Other Languages of Europe: Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives; see ED 453 678.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Diversity (Student); *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Heritage Education; Immigrants; *Language Maintenance; Language Minorities; Mass Media Role
IDENTIFIERS *Germany

ABSTRACT

About 10 million inhabitants of Germany are of non-German origin and use German and one or more other languages in their everyday life. The number of foreign students in German schools is constantly growing. About 25 percent of Germany's foreign population are citizens of other European Union states. The largest group of minority language speakers in Germany, and the most important ethnolinguistic group, are Turkish citizens. The second largest group of minority language speakers are Bosnians/Croatians/Serbians, followed by Italians. German immigration and integration policies legally define the various immigrant groups with different rights, which affects their language maintenance. Newspapers are available in all important immigrant languages, and radio and television broadcast some programs in other languages. Teaching of immigrant languages in supplementary lessons was introduced in the late 1960s. This paper presents examples of educational policies in three German states: Hamburg, a center of massive immigration with changing educational policy; Northrhine-Westphalia, Germany's largest state, which has a high immigration rate and an educational policy devoted to linguistic diversity; and Hesse, a state with different immigration patterns that supported immigrant languages in school until 1999. (Contains 22 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 296

Immigrant Languages in Federal Germany

Ingrid Gogolin
Hans Reich

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ingrid Gogolin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

FL 027 128

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Immigrant languages in federal Germany

INGRID GOGOLIN
HANS REICH

Immigration is a federal responsibility in Germany, whereas integration policy is at least partly under the responsibility of the States (*Länder*). Education especially, including education of immigrants, is a State domain. Accordingly, this chapter starts with an outline of the demographical situation, followed by an overview of the sociolinguistic situation, both concerning Germany as a whole. In the third section, which deals with education, we present the examples of three *Länder*:

- The example of the City State of Hamburg, a centre of massive immigration with changing educational policy.
- The example of Northrhine-Westphalia, Germany's largest State, comprising the conurbation of the Ruhr and other industrial centres with a high immigration rate, but also areas of a more rural character; educational policy in Northrhine-Westphalia has been devoted to linguistic diversity for a long time.
- The example of Hesse, also a State with different immigration patterns: the European metropolis of Frankfurt and the surrounding area as a centre of immigration and more rural areas with considerably lower immigration rates; in the past Hesse supported immigrant languages in schools, but things changed abruptly in 1999.

We conclude with some remarks on the future development of language policies in Germany.

Demographic data

About ten million inhabitants of Germany are of non-German origin and bi- or multilingual in the sense that they use German *and* one or more languages other than German in their everyday life. But as a matter of fact no reliable statistical data are available, neither on the ethnocultural composition of Germany's population nor on the sociolinguistic status quo in Germany. Neither can the number of speakers of languages other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

than German can be indicated reliably nor can the number of languages spoken by them be stated. The absence of such data is due to the self-conception of the German nation state. Until recently, despite all evidence, Germany considered itself to be a non-immigration country, which in the same vein meant: a monolingual country. Thus, official data are only available about non-German citizens (*Ausländer*) living in Germany, be it permanently or temporarily. These data are unsuitable for statements about cultural and linguistic plurality in Germany. Firstly, the equation of nation state and language is trivial and absurd. Secondly, a growing number of those who have immigrated to Germany possess German citizenship. They may be immigrants with the legal status of *Aussiedler*, i.e. immigrants from Eastern Europe who are able to prove that they are of German descent, or they may be naturalised immigrants from anywhere else who applied for German citizenship after having been in Germany for at least eight years, or they may be the spouse of a German citizen and have made use of the option to get a German pa: sport.

Due to a change in citizenship legislation effective since January 1, 2000, the number of bi- or multilingual German citizens with an immigrant background will grow tremendously. Children of immigrant families who are born in Germany, automatically receive German citizenship now, and parents with non-German passports who have children below the age of seven can apply for German citizenship for them. Until the age of 23, all these 'Germans' are allowed to hold dual citizenship; afterwards they have to decide on one or the other. With this new legislation, Germany withdrew - although not totally - from the *ius sanguinis* as the basic principle of citizenship.

As we know from research, immigrants - even if they change their passports - do not necessarily give up their cultures and languages of origin. Therefore, no reliable statistical data on the demographic status of immigrant groups and immigrant languages and on distribution and vitality of these languages in Germany can currently be provided. All statistical information given below is therefore based on the inadequate criterion of citizenship; all other information can only be based on much weaker data, such as reasoned estimates or small-scale research, mostly in terms of regional case studies.

Post-war immigration

Immigration to Germany is a constant factor since the end of World War II. The first considerable pattern of immigration consisted of German nationals who came as refugees from Eastern European countries. Until

the early fifties, nearly 12 million of these refugees came to Germany, most of them with traumatic war and post-war experiences. Additional immigrants from the same regions came to Germany with the legal status of *Aussiedler*. Since the beginning of the fifties until 1999, nearly four million people belonging to this group immigrated to Germany, most of them Russian or Polish-speaking people. Germany faced a tremendous growth of the numbers of these immigrants after 1989, due to the collapse of the socialist systems. The political reaction to this collapse from German side was a restriction of immigration possibilities for *Aussiedler* and a cutback in subsidies for them. Today, the numbers of applicants for *Aussiedler* immigration to Germany are decreasing considerably.

The next large immigration flow to Germany is made up by the group of *Gastarbeiter*, guest workers who were mostly recruited in Mediterranean countries from 1955 on; in 1999 approximately 4.5 million people belonged to this group of immigrants. Bilateral contracts were signed until the early seventies with Italy, Yugoslavia, Morocco, Portugal, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey and, for a short time, Korea. In 1973, due to a massive economic crisis, a recruitment stop was enacted. Paradoxically, this led to a considerable rise in immigration from these countries - especially of children - because the reunion of families was still legal. In the year 2000 the German government revitalised this type of immigration, i.e. recruitment of workers from abroad. Now the aim is the recruitment of highly skilled workers, especially in the domain of communication and information technologies.

The *Gastarbeiter* immigration since the middle of the fifties concerned only the western part of Germany, the former Federal Republic. The former GDR also had made contracts for the recruitment of workforces with some countries: in the sixties with some Eastern European neighbours, after 1970 with Cuba, Vietnam and some African states. But the immigration to the GDR differs considerably from that to the Western *Länder*. Firstly, only a small number of *Vertragsarbeiter* (contract workers) came to the GDR - altogether no more than 90,000 until 1990, i.e. 1.4% of the number of persons employed. Secondly, the contract workers were submitted to a rigid rotation system; they had to leave the country after a strictly limited period of time and the reunion with family members or the foundation of a family was as unwelcome as other signs of integration (cf. Krüger-Potratz, 1991; Gruner-Domic, 1999).

The most recent type of immigration to Germany - so-called new immigrants - comprises asylum-seekers or other refugees, seasonal workers, and also people entering the country illegally. Obviously, there

are no reliable statistical data on the latter type of immigration, but all estimations assume that their numbers are rising. In 1960, the proportion of non-German citizens in the Federal Republic of Germany amounted to 1.2%; in 1999, it amounted to around 10%, which is approximately 7.5 million people (cf. *Ausländerbeauftragte*, 2000).

As yet, the 'foreign' population is distributed unevenly over the *Länder*. Whereas the proportion of 'foreigners' in the Western *Länder* ('old' FRG) lies somewhere between 5% (Schleswig-Holstein) and 14% (Hesse, Berlin), none of the Eastern *Länder* count more than 2.5% of 'foreigners'. Most of them live in urban areas. The city of Frankfurt am Main has the largest proportion of 'foreigners' with more than 30% of the population; all major cities in Germany - Berlin, Cologne, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich - and the conglomerates - the *Ruhrgebiet* in Northrhine-Westphalia, the *Rhein-Main* area in Hesse - get close to this percentage of residents with foreign passports. A growing proportion of 'foreigners' is long-settling in Germany; 30% of them have been living there for 20 years or more, 50% for ten years or more.

Corresponding to this demographic situation, the number of 'foreign' pupils in German schools is also continuously growing. In 1997, approximately 1.2 million pupils with non-German passports attended the school system (approximately 10% of the student population). The number rose from approximately 670,000 to 960,000 between 1985 and 1995 in the compulsory school system, and it nearly doubled in the same period in the vocational school system (from approximately 120,000 to 220,000). With reference to passports, the German school system today still does not guarantee equal access to school success. Whereas nearly 30% of the pupils with German passports finish their school career with the *Abitur* - i.e. receive the final examination of highest value - this applies only to less than 10% of the 'foreign' pupils. And whereas less than 10% of the pupils with German passports leave school with the lowest type of exam (*Hauptschulabschluß*), this applies to more than 20% of the 'foreign' pupils. Generally speaking, the German school system distributes school success along ethnic lines.

Nationalities

Official statistics on Federal State level give detailed information about immigrants from 139 states of origin. About 25% of Germany's 'foreign' population are citizens of other EU member states. Their numbers rose until 1994 and have been stable since then. The highest proportions of EU members come from Italy (33% of EU members) and Greece (approximately 20%). Next are Austrians (10%), Portuguese (7.1%), Spaniards (7.1%), British citizens (6.2%) and people from the Netherlands (6.0%) (cf. *Ausländerbeauftragte*, 2000: 17).

The largest group of 'foreigners' in Germany, however, are Turkish citizens (1998: 30% of the 'foreigners'/2.11 million people, cf. *Ausländerbeauftragte*, 2000: 232), followed by people from the Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro, 720,000 or 9.8%), Italians (612,000 or 8.4%), Greeks (363,000 or 5%) and people from Poland (283,000 or 3.9%) (*Ausländerbeauftragte*, 2000: 17).

Sociolinguistic evidence

It is rather difficult to determine which groups of immigrants in Germany can be addressed as linguistic communities. Obviously, the number of speakers plays a role, but this is not the only nor the decisive factor. Social conditions and political opportunities or obstacles play a role as well. In the end, however, it is the linguistic behaviour of the groups and the way they see themselves that matters.

Unfortunately, there has been and still is little language survey research in Germany. As we pointed out already, large-scale data on patterns of language use, degree of linguistic competencies, language maintenance or loss are not available, neither at the national nor at the state level, with the exception of the State of Hamburg. Only general impressions can be given. Below we refer to the size and social structure of the language groups, legal status and language maintenance, and the role of the media.

Size and social structure of the language groups

Speakers of the following languages reach a group size above 100,000 in Germany: Arabic, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Dutch, English, Farsi, French, Greek, Italian, Kurdish, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, Turkish and Vietnamese. Out of these, Dutch, English and French can hardly be seen as immigrant languages, even though they also contribute to the linguistic diversity of Germany. On the other hand, there is no doubt that smaller groups such as speakers of Albanian, Chinese, Korean or Japanese function as linguistic communities in Germany and may at least partly be seen as immigrant languages. All these groups differ not only in size but also in social structure, linguistic behaviour and

other aspects. Therefore, a comprehensive view is impossible. Three groups are presented here as typical examples.

The most important ethnolinguistic group are the Turkish-speaking immigrants. They form the most visible minority. Turkish shops - from fast food to travel agencies - are to be found in all towns. In the cities districts exist with high proportions of Turkish people, where life in the streets has a quasi-oriental character. In such quarters all goods and services that are necessary for everyday life - from medical provisions to books, gifts, toys, clothing, food and entertainment - are available 'in Turkish'. Children who grow up during their pre-school years in such an environment acquire Turkish nearly to the same degree of competence as monolingual Turkish children do in Turkey (Hepsöyler & Liebe-Harkort, 1991: 21-25; Pfaff, 1993: 126; Mehrländer *et al.*, 1996: Chapter 10.4). The problem here lies more in the acquisition of German as a second language. The birth rate of the Turkish population in Germany is still remarkably high, more than twice the birth rate of the German population (Statistisches Bundesamt, 1999: Table 3.29). There are a large number of religious, political, social or cultural associations and institutions where Turkish is spoken regularly. A new middle-class is emerging with Turkish entrepreneurs (not only in ethnic business), doctors, clerks, teachers and social workers (for details see Şen & Goldberg, 1994). Given these circumstances and taking into account that language loyalty in Turkish emigrant communities seems to be above average, as research in other countries also indicates (see Löfgren, 1991: Tables 3.14 and 4.12; Jørgensen & Holmen, 1994: 124-130; Tribalat, 1995: 47), it can be taken for granted that the Turkish minority in Germany is a vital and viable linguistic community.

Quite different from this is the situation of speakers of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, quantitatively the second largest group of minority language speakers in Germany. Their starting conditions were not bad. The early immigrants had a relatively higher degree of education than other guest-workers and a relatively higher socio-economic status. They started as a self-conscious minority with good prospects. The Yugoslav wars deeply changed the course of their migration history. Refugees joined the former labour migrants, often in a state of desperation and with no other future prospect than a forced return to their destroyed home country. The political separation of the State of Yugoslavia troubled the political as well as the linguistic loyalties of the emigrants. Associations which referred to national rather than regional identity broke down and support by the official representatives of the country or countries of origin

diminished considerably. Again, the birth rate might be a good indicator: it is far below the birth rate of the Turkish population in Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 1999: Table 3.29). The younger generation starts - as it seems - to turn away from the language of origin and there is little probability of a reversal of the language shift process, unless completely new conditions would arise.

The Italian-speaking community serves as the third example. Italian guest workers were the first to immigrate to post-war Germany and at that time had to bear all the weight of prejudice and marginalization. Being European Union citizens from the beginning, they had the opportunity of free movement and they made the most of that. Patterns of two-way migration are rather frequent amongst them. Although they have been residing in Germany longer than any other group of immigrants, their social status (as indicated by e.g. unemployment rates) is still below average. On the other hand, Italian is an official European Union language and cultural ties between Germany and Italy are traditionally close. Language maintenance in the group of Italian workers in Germany seems to be on an average level. At the same time, the Italian language and culture are represented in Germany by middle and upper class people as well. There are *Instituti di Cultura Italiana* in several places in Germany, which support the dissemination of Italian language and literature. But as far as we can see, they offer hardly any activities concerning the cultural and linguistic needs or expectations of Italian migrants in Germany. Italian high-brow culture, popular culture and immigrants' cultural expressions are all visible in Germany, but rather separated from each other. The position of the Italian government is not quite clear. Sometimes it seems that the high-brow cultural export is supported to the detriment of the migrants. Sometimes it seems that links are looked for between these two different target groups of Italy's external cultural politics, but even in this case it seems that language maintenance amongst migrant workers is seen as less valuable than the expansion of Italian as a 'foreign' language.

Legal status and language maintenance

German immigration and integration policies tend to legally define different groups of immigrants with different rights. These legal definitions affect the groups' self-perceptions and possibilities to act, including their actions with regard to the maintenance of language and culture. Two opposite examples are given here: Russian-speaking *Aussiedler* and Spanish-speaking guest workers.

In the former Soviet Union the German-speaking minority, whose ancestors had been living there during the tsarist and early Soviet periods on more or less homogeneous speech islands, was dispersed during the Stalin era, collectively suspected of fascism and oppressed heavily. They slowly recovered during the following decades, but could not and in most cases did not want to hinder language shift in the next and following generations. German became the language of the grandparents and was hidden in public. When, in the eighties, the chance arose to 'remigrate' to Germany, parents and children alike had to learn German. Since they were regarded and treated as German nationals under certain conditions, it was generally expected (also by most of the *Aussiedler* themselves) that they would stop speaking Russian after a short period of time. But, as researchers in bilingualism are very well aware, things are not as simple as that. Many *Aussiedler* families continue to speak Russian at home, but now avoid speaking this language in public, because this is seen as 'shameful bilingualism' (Berend, 1998: 47-50). Although there are - mostly local - German-Russian organizations and some ethnic businesses, the idea that there could be a stable Russian-speaking community in Germany is not shared by many. Because the *Aussiedler* are German citizens, they could claim minority rights with more prospect of success than any other immigrant group. They lack, however, self-confidence to act accordingly and probably will not survive as a linguistic minority.

The Spanish-speaking community may serve as the opposite example. Spanish guest workers entered Germany during the sixties and seventies, which was politically and economically a difficult time in Spain. After the end of Franco's dictatorship in 1975, many emigrants returned to Spain. Between 1975 and 1985 the Spanish population in Germany decreased by approximately 1000 persons per year. At the same time substantial support was given by the Spanish government and its representatives abroad to migrants who stayed in the host countries. Language maintenance was and is one of the aims of this support. When Spain became a member of the European Union in 1986, the Spanish language, which always had been an important European and global language, gained additional momentum for the emigrants. Arguments of utility and identity converged and a high degree of stable Spanish-German bilingualism was the result. Although the Spanish-speaking community is relatively small, it can be supposed that it will maintain its bilingualism in the future.

Role of the media

Newspapers are available in all important languages of immigrants in Germany. The wholesale trade offers more than 50 newspapers for 'guest workers', mostly imported from the countries of origin. But there are also special editorial offices in Frankfurt which edit eight specific German issues of important Turkish newspapers. The Russian-German community disposes of several bilingual newspapers of its own. Recently, several bilingual (mostly Turkish-German) magazines have emerged, directed especially towards immigrant youngsters and dealing with topics such as popular music, the job market and ethnic business.

The broadcasting services under public law transmit programmes in Italian, Turkish, Spanish, Greek and Serbian/Croatian (40 minutes daily per language). The television services under public law transmit two programmes weekly which are targeted towards the immigrant public, one in German, one in dual channel technique. In Berlin four private stations broadcast programmes in Turkish. Of greater significance are the tv programmes imported from the countries of origin by cable (e.g. TRT international) or via satellite.

Internet is used by immigrant associations and political speakers and by the immigrants press. Some of the presentations are monolingual in the language of origin, some bilingual with German as the partner language. But there are also bilingual sites with the language of origin and English as partner language (e.g. the Turkish newspaper *Milliyet*). Recently, a Turkish community website has been installed which offers general information, news, chats, discussion fora etcetera - all in both languages.

Education

Teaching of immigrant languages in supplementary lessons was introduced in the 'old' FRG in the late sixties. This teaching took place according to the following framework. Since 1964, 'foreign' children in Germany should in principle receive the same educational opportunities as German children. If it was considered to be advantageous for this aim, teaching of their language of origin (officially referred to as 'mother tongue teaching') could be provided in addition to the regular curriculum. The so-called 'mother tongue teaching' should, according to the relevant decrees, contribute to the social integration of the pupils 'for the duration of their stay in the Federal Republic of Germany' and at the

same time 'preserve their linguistic and cultural identity'. The underlying agenda of these recommendations was, similarly to policies in other European immigration countries and the official European Union policy, an assimilation or rotation perspective.

The basic organisational measures for which the *Länder* could opt were the following:

- Supplementary teaching of the mother tongue as an offer for immigrant children attending mainstream classes. This teaching could take place in addition to the regular curriculum and school day and should not exceed five lessons a week.
- Mother tongue teaching in replacement of the first or second obligatory 'foreign' language (usually English or French). This special measure for 'foreign' pupils aimed at saving them from the burden of learning 'regular' foreign languages in case their German competencies were poor. In practice, the acceptance of this offer could mean a severe limitation of the potential school success, as the acquisition of the highest qualification (*Abitur*) is bound to a fixed catalogue of obligatory 'foreign' languages in Germany; none of the immigrant languages belongs to this catalogue. Therefore a 'foreign pupil who accepted this offer was either excluded from the highest qualification or constrained to the additional learning of obligatory 'foreign' languages.
- 'Mother tongue' as a subject and as a medium of instruction in reception classes for pupils of the same nationality, in Bavaria referred to as 'bilingual classes'. This model was vehemently criticized as it turned out to be an excluding educational system for 'foreigners', providing them with a formal qualification which *de facto* was inferior and stigmatizing. This type of teaching is now disappearing.

Within the outlined framework the responsibility for organisation, financing and curriculum development could be assumed in two different ways.

- Five of the then eleven *Länder* (FRG before 1990) made themselves responsible for this teaching, i.e. Bavaria, Hesse, Lower Saxony, Northrhine-Westphalia and Rhineland-Palatinate.
- The remaining six *Länder* placed the teaching in the hands of the countries of origin. These *Länder* contributed to the teaching by a share of the costs, e.g. by providing classrooms free of charge. These *Länder* were Baden-Württemberg, Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg, Saarland and Schleswig-Holstein.

After the German unification, the East German *Länder* also introduced regulations for mother tongue teaching into their new school legislation, usually following the first model mentioned above. But as the actual numbers of immigrant children in the East German *Länder* are still very low, the teaching is realized only here and there, mostly in larger cities.

Since the character of immigration has changed, in some States the *status quo* has come under discussion. We can not go into a description and analysis of the school policies of all the 16 *Länder* with regard to immigrant languages (but see Gogolin *et al.*, 2000). Only three typical examples will be presented here: the cases of Hamburg, Northrhine-Westphalia and Hesse.

Hamburg

Of the 1.7 million inhabitants of Hamburg, approximately 280,000 (16%) have passports other than German. In the last decade, both the absolute and relative number of 'foreign' children in Hamburg's schools rose continuously. Whereas in 1987, 15.4% of the school population (ca. 25,000 children) had passports other than German, in 1998 this was 19.5% (ca. 33,000). In addition, about 6000 children from *Aussiedler* families or from bi-national parents had a migrant background. Nearly 40% of the 'foreign' children have Turkish passports; other large groups come from former Yugoslav states, Iran, Poland, Albania and some EU member states. The official statistics refer to the second-largest group of 'foreign' children in the category 'other nationalities', more than 35% of these children belong to this group. As estimated by the Hamburg school board, this group contains around 100 different nationalities.

Since 1996, the Ministry of Education of the *Land* Hamburg has been trying to gather data on the number of languages spoken by children in the Hamburg school system. Every school is obliged to report these data to the statistical office of the ministry. According to these data, in the year 1999 around 90 languages were spoken by a total of 34,000 Hamburg school children with an immigrant background. The largest groups were Turkish (around 10,800 speakers), Russian (4500 speakers), Polish (2300 speakers), Farsi (2300 speakers) and Dari (1900 speakers), followed by Bosnian, Arabic and Serbo-Croatian. Unfortunately we must expect this information to be rather weak. From interviews with teachers and head teachers in case studies we know that many of them have no profound knowledge of the cultural or linguistic background of the children they teach. Very often, the equation of 'one state, one language' is used by teachers (as well as by other officials) as a rationale for their indication of

a child's linguistic background. Therefore we must expect that the real variety of languages spoken by children in Hamburg schools is higher than the above mentioned figures.

As indicated before, Hamburg was one of the *Länder* which traditionally placed the teaching of immigrant languages in the hands of the countries of origin. In Hamburg the Consulates of these countries were responsible for the financing and recruitment of teachers. The responsibility for the inspectorate was shared between Hamburg and the respective country; the *Land* Hamburg contributed to the teaching by an allowance of roughly half a million DM per year and by providing classrooms free of charge. In 1996, 104 classes for 'mother tongue teaching' of this type existed; 87 teachers appointed by foreign Consulates taught in these classes.

Since the beginning, this traditional policy - established in 1976 - was intensely criticized by political representatives of immigrants as well as by experts from the educational and research field. As a first reaction to this criticism, a measure in favour of children of Turkish origin was established in 1986. In order to 'safeguard their linguistic and cultural identity' (*Richtlinien und Hinweise für die Erziehung und den Unterricht ausländischer Kinder und Jugendlichen*, Hamburg, 1986: Par. 4), these children were conceded the possibility of taking part in five lessons of teaching in their mother tongue a week, two of which could be dedicated to Islamic religious instruction. The teachers, 35 on average since 1986 due to this measure, were appointed by the *Land* Hamburg; some of them worked in more than one school. Criticism of this policy did not stop after the introduction of the new measure; on the contrary. It was now argued, that the *Land* created an additional inequality which was not in conformity with the general principles of democratic education.

In 1997, an amendment of the general school legislation took place in the *Land*; some of the major critical arguments against the former language policies were reflected in the innovation process. The preamble to the new School Law says: 'Children and youngsters whose first language is not German, under consideration of their ethnic and cultural identity, have to be supported in such a way that they can develop their bilingualism and that they can actively take part in instruction as well as in school life' (translated *Hamburger Schulgesetz* of April 10, 1997: Section 3.3). The new Hamburg Government, consisting since 1998 of a coalition between the Social Democrat and the Green Party, started to put this into action by establishing a range of new measures. The most relevant one is the intention of taking over the responsibility for the teaching of all

immigrant languages. Hamburg still allows the consulates to offer teaching and cooperates with those who do so, but the *Land* is establishing a procedure to make itself responsible for this teaching, if necessary together with the country of origin. The teaching may now take place within regular school hours, and as a rule the teachers will be appointed by the *Land* (mostly not as regularly employed teachers, however, but based on hourly wages). Furthermore, the *Land* is prepared to take over the inspectorate, also in those cases where the consulates are still responsible, and it is in the process of establishing special curricula for this teaching.

In order to realize the new policy, the following action programme was established:

- Mother tongue teaching in primary schools can now be integrated in the regular school day as part of the regular timetable; it is planned to extend this regulation also to secondary schools. The possibility for children to take part in this teaching is no longer dependent on citizenship of a country of origin representing a particular language, but on the parents' wish.
- The marks pupils receive in this teaching are mentioned in the pupils' school reports.
- The number of languages taught is going to be extended. In addition to Turkish, already offered are Kurdish, Dari, Farsi and Russian. It is planned to take over the teaching in Italian, Portuguese and Albanian from the respective consulates.
- The *Land* established an in-service training course for the teachers (most of them being native speakers of the respective languages, but not necessarily qualified teachers), aiming, to impart special skills to them for the teaching of immigrant languages in a multilingual context.
- The *Land* established a system of examinations in immigrant languages. This measure aims to provide an opportunity to those pupils who do not have access to mother tongue teaching within the Hamburg school system to receive regular and officially accepted credits for their performance in extracurricular courses.
- The development of syllabuses and teaching material for the teaching of immigrant languages in a multilingual context has been started.
- The *Land* introduced two primary schools with bilingual programmes (one with German and Italian, one with German and Portuguese) in 1999/2000. The schools start teaching both languages from the first school day on and aim to achieve co-ordinated literacy for the

children. The project is carried out in cooperation with the respective consulates which contribute to the programme by providing the teachers for Italian and Portuguese respectively. It is planned to expand the programme to other schools and other languages, e.g. Russian.

- A research project aimed at evaluation of the language skills of school beginners with a Turkish background in both Turkish and German was carried out in 1999.
- The school board offers German classes to immigrant parents, which can take place at the schools their children attend.
- The school board makes information brochures available about the Hamburg school system, with a special focus on language education, in different immigrant languages.

Given the recent decisions and measures planned or already established, the *Land* Hamburg is one - fortunately not the only - example of a possible change of basic political attitudes towards multilingualism in the German *Lander*. At least certain parts of the political sphere began to realize that multilingualism in German society (not only in Hamburg) is an undeniable fact and that it is unwise to react to this fact only in a declining manner. Moreover, the new policy towards immigrant languages is in best conformity with recent recommendations of the permanent Conference of Ministers of Education with regard to intercultural education. It is stated there that immigrant languages mean a profit for German society as a whole and for the schools, and that efforts should be made to increase this profit both for those children who live in bi- or multilingual families and for those who grow up monolingually in German.

Thus, we can draw a rather positive and promising picture about the prospects of immigrant language teaching in Hamburg in terms of taking steps towards 'moving away from a monolingual habitus' (cf. Gogolin, 1994 for this term). Nevertheless, it is impossible to make any predictions about the future development. There are also negative indications. Growing opposition against the recent political decisions can be perceived. It is argued that immigrant language teaching is too expensive for the Hamburg school system; that the promotion of bilingualism is no guarantee for better success in the dominantly German school; and that the recognition of multilingualism impedes the immigrants' integration into German society.

Northrhine-Westphalia

Around two million 'foreigners' live in Northrhine-Westphalia, i.e. more than 11% of the population. If we take children into account, their percentage of the population is twice as high. In 1997 about 22% of the children in Northrhine-Westphalia were 'foreigners' (*Landtag* Nordrhein-Westfalen, *Drucksache* 12/2552, November 10, 1997). Children of Turkish origin make up the largest group of 'foreign' children (about 47%). The proportion of 'foreign' children in kindergarten rose from 11.6% in 1993 to 14.8% in 1998. The population of 'foreign' school children increased by about 27% in the last decade. In absolute figures, Northrhine-Westphalia is the German *Land* with most school children of 'foreign' citizenship; one third of all 'foreign' children in Germany visit a school in this *Land*. Only 2% of the schools in Northrhine-Westphalia have no 'foreign' children in their school population (*Ministerium für Arbeit*, 2000).

As is usual in the German school system, the medium of instruction in Northrhine-Westphalian schools is German. In the secondary system at least one 'foreign' language - commonly English - is obligatory for all children. Exceptions have been made for 'foreign' children, in particular for those of Turkish origin, whose German is considered to be insufficient for a promising school career or for mastering an additional language; they may choose to take their home language instead. In this context the following languages are offered 'instead of the first foreign language': Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Turkish. As already mentioned, the decision for this offer may lead children into a dead end school career because English is a prerequisite for the *Abitur* as the school-leaving exam of highest value.

As mentioned above, Northrhine-Westphalia is one of the *Länder* which took mother tongue teaching into its own responsibility. At first, it was offered only for the official languages of those countries with which bilateral agreements about the recruitment of workforces existed, i.e. for children of Greek, Italian, Moroccan, Portuguese, Spanish, Tunisian and Turkish citizenship and for children from former Yugoslavia. According to the pertinent decree, teaching should not exceed five lessons a week and the lessons could include aspects of the history of the country of origin and - in the case of Turkish and Greek - religious instruction. In practice, as we know from statistical data, the teaching rarely exceeded three lessons a week. The marks children get for this teaching are integrated in their school reports. In 1999, around 50% of the 'foreign' pupils in primary schools for whom an offer of mother tongue teaching was made took part in the lessons. For those children for whom no offer

of instruction in the home language is made, the *Land* offers the possibility to pass extracurricular school-leaving examinations in their languages. Around 10,000 pupils a year make use of this offer. Languages in great demand are Russian, Polish, Vietnamese, Czech, Farsi, Urdu and Albanian.

In the meantime, the *Land* reacted to the changes of immigration processes and altered some of the regulations on mother tongue teaching. The possibility to participate in this instruction is no longer strictly bound to the nationality of a pupil; moreover, not only national languages are taught but also minority languages within the countries of origin, such as Kurdish. The relevant decree formulates the general objective of the instruction as follows: it should "contribute to the integration of linguistic minorities into (German) society and aim at the development of bi- or multilingualism as an essential element of intercultural education in an internationally mobile society" (*Landtag* Nordrhein-Westfalen, *Drucksache* 12/2552, 1997, 3). In order to improve and evaluate various options to realize these objectives in practice, the *Land* organized a number of model projects in schools, some of them under the auspices of European Union programmes in terms of 'Comenius'. One example is the project 'Opening of Mother Tongue Teaching' (1994-1997; cf. *Landesinstitut*, 1998a) which tried out possibilities of co-educating children with a bilingual background in German and the pertinent language and children without basic knowledge of the latter. The evaluation of the project showed that this teaching was very successful in terms of intercultural objectives but less successful in terms of linguistic aims in a narrower sense.

Another innovative initiative in the *Land* was the project *Begegnungssprachen in der Grundschule* (Languages of Encounter in primary schools; cf. *Landesinstitut*, 1998b). With this project the *Land* offered an alternative to early 'foreign' language learning. *Begegnungssprachenunterricht* functioned in the sense of language awareness instruction. The participating primary schools were free to choose the language(s) of encounter: it could be English, but likewise a language or languages spoken by children in the school or a language of neighbours (e.g. Dutch in the German-Dutch border area). At a rhetorical level, this project was evaluated very positively. It was regarded as a very promising approach to primary school children's abilities and affections and as more convenient for them than traditional 'foreign' language teaching. At the same time the project was considered to be too demanding for teachers. Their prerequisites, i.e. knowledge as well as methodical competence for the development of children's abilities for appropriate interaction in multilingual settings

rather than learning words and sentences of one specific 'foreign' language, were insufficient. Although the *Land* had initiated the development of teaching material, most of this concerned English as *Begegnungssprache* and was therefore hardly useful for all schools with other *Begegnungssprachen*, especially the languages of immigrant minorities in the *Land*. Not surprisingly, about 90% of the schools that took part in this experiment opted for English as *Begegnungssprache*. Likewise unsatisfactory was the in-service training of primary school teachers, who in their initial training are usually not confronted with the challenges of multilingual classrooms, for the purpose of their specific role in the teaching of *Begegnungssprachen*.

As a reaction to the ambivalent evaluation of the project *Begegnungssprachen*, a new policy was recently introduced. The newly elected government of the *Land* strengthens the role of English in primary as well as in secondary schools. Only recently, English was introduced as the first 'foreign' language in primary schools. Until now, primary schools opt voluntarily for the introduction of English; in the year 2000, about 3450 schools or 17,000 classes made use of this possibility. From the year 2003 on, English as first 'foreign' language will be obligatory in primary schools from the third grade on. Secondary schools were encouraged to offer subjects through in the medium of another language than German or to take part in model projects under the heading of bilingual schools, mostly with English and very few with French as the 'foreign' language of instruction. All these activities are accompanied by official statements that this policy is not meant as competitive towards immigrant languages. The teaching of English as well as the teaching of immigrant languages should contribute to the development of a multicultural and multilingual atmosphere in the *Land* and to a notion of equality of languages. It cannot be foreseen if the new policy of the *Land* will turn out as repressive for immigrant languages or - as it is officially declared - as beneficial to them.

Hesse

In 1996, about 28,000 children of foreign nationality attended kindergarten in Hesse, which amounts to 81.4% of the 3-6 years olds (as compared to 94.5% of the German population) (*Ausländerreport* Hessen, 1998: Table 5.3). The language usually spoken in kindergarten is German, but there are some kindergartens in the cities which employ bilingual educators also. In the same year, 107,000 pupils of foreign nationality attended primary and secondary schools in Hesse, which amounts to 15.5% of the total school population. The medium of instruction is

German. 'Foreign' languages are taught in all secondary schools and to an increasing degree also in primary schools, mainly English. There is one 'European' school in Frankfurt which offers a German-Italian bilingual branch from grade 1 on. The Hessian employers support a programme of bilingual vocational training with German and Italian/Greek/Portuguese/Spanish as partner languages.

As mentioned above, Hesse had decided to offer 'mother tongue teaching' to children of immigrants from the former recruitment countries of 'guest workers' in the form of supplementary lessons (up to five lessons per week) under the State government's responsibility. Attendance was voluntary. The teachers were employed by the State government but they were mostly educated in the countries of origin.

In the eighties the State of Hesse went ahead with curriculum development. It was ordinated in 1983 that 'mother tongues' should be seen as a 'regular learning area' and should be introduced into the timetable with two lessons in grade 1, three lessons in grade 2, and five lessons from grade 3 on. Pupils with the nationality of one of the former recruitment countries were obliged to attend these lessons, if offered at their own or a neighbouring school (with a minimum group size of ten pupils), unless a demand of exemption was made by the parents. This regulation was unique in the Federal Republic of Germany. The figures of pupils attending lessons of so-called 'heritage' languages went up from 54% of the target group in 1980 to 68% in 1985. In some years they were higher than 70%; in 1996 (last figure available) the rate was 62% (*Ausländerreport* Hessen, 1998: Table 6.14; Reich & Hienz de Albentiis, 1998: 22-24).

In the framework of this policy, syllabuses were developed for primary (1985) and secondary schools (1996). A centre for the teaching of 'heritage' languages was established in Frankfurt and became responsible for material development, in-service training and counselling. Lastly, in-service programmes were set up in order to give at least part of the mother tongue teachers a qualified teacher status in Hesse. In 1992 the restriction of mother tongue teaching to pupils of the former recruitment countries was done away with and other immigrant languages, including the languages of the *Aussiedler*, could be offered at schools as well. Mother tongue teaching was formally enacted in §8a (3) of the School Act as an ordinary subject matter in Hessian schools. Contents and aims were explicitly placed in a European and intercultural perspective. At that time, the teaching of immigrant languages had reached the best possible legal status in the *Land* Hesse.

The year 1999 revealed that the maintenance of this legislation was not assured. After a populist campaign against the (federal) bill on nationality which should make double nationality more accessible, the conservative party won the (regional) elections, formed a coalition with the liberals and took over government from the former Social Democrat - Green Party coalition. One of the first initiatives of the new government was to propose an amendment of the School Act in order to 'secure quality in Hessian schools'. Succinctly the bill says: *§8a Abs. 3 wird aufgehoben* (immigrant language teaching is abolished). In 1999 this bill was adopted by the Hessian Parliament.

It is an extreme case, but it shows what is to be feared in Germany. The results of devoted work in educational policy, referred to as a model for other States of the Federal Republic, was destroyed in a few months time. Neither conservative values nor any arguments of school quality can justify this decision. Not even financial reasons are convincing in this case. Since most of the mother tongue teachers cannot be dismissed over the next years, they have to be occupied with other activities in schools. One is forced to conclude that it was mainly ignorance relying on common sense which caused this disaster. Three decades of intercultural pedagogy - school practice, work of educationalists, official decrees and recommendations - were not enough to convince the political elite and the public opinion. As a result, a monolingual ethnocentric mind-set prevails.

Conclusion

Legislation in Germany is first of all characterised by indifference towards language issues at the constitutional level. The Constitution neither states a national language nor does it mention minority languages. In accordance with international conventions, however, it guarantees freedom of language choice, implicitly by the constitutional articles on free personal development (Art. 2) and freedom of communication (Art. 5), explicitly by the article on non-discrimination (Art. 3). As far as we know these human right principles of individual linguistic freedom are not severely violated in Germany.

In the constitutional discussion after the unification of the two German Republics it was proposed to introduce a new article on minority protection into the Federal Constitution, but this proposal met resistance from both the conservative and the progressive side and was finally

rejected by the German Parliament. Constitutional jurisprudence, however, keeps discussing this issue seriously (Robbers, 1994).

In three State Constitutions (i.e. in Brandenburg, Saxony, Schleswig-Holstein) minority rights are formally spelled out. They protect the indigenous minorities of Sorbs, Danes and Northern Frisians. In accordance with the European Charter on regional and minority languages and the prevailing positions in constitutional law, a sharp distinction is made between indigenous and immigrated linguistic communities, irrespective of demographic, cultural and pedagogical arguments. Only the Constitution of Saxony adds a section to the minority rights article indicating that the State respects the interests of those 'foreign' minorities whose members legally live in the country.

Consequently, all linguistic activities of immigrant groups rely on individual human rights. Within this framework room is given for associative and political action. Again, to our knowledge, associative action with regard to minority language maintenance is not severely hindered in Germany, but it has to be seen in the framework of rather restricted possibilities for political participation of immigrants in general. It is true that self-organisations can and really do get impressive work done in language maintenance, that in some important cases the official representatives of the countries of origin give considerable support and that the Ministries of Education are in generally not reluctant to ideas of linguistic diversity, preferably in a European context. But it is also true that the school system is not eager to integrate immigrant language teaching into the common curriculum, that huge differences in language prestige continue to be spread in the public opinion and that campaigns against immigrant language teaching are supposed to win votes in elections. The idea of a multilingual Germany is not prevailing, neither in political mindsets nor in the public opinion. As yet, much depends on the immigrant groups themselves. There are resources for language maintenance, there is a tradition of teaching immigrant languages in the regular school system (although it is not stable) and there are supporters of a policy of pluralistic integration, also with regard to language, in the social sciences (Schulte, 1998). In sum, the case for immigrant languages is not closed in Germany.

References

Ausländerreport Hessen (1998) *Bevölkerung, Ausbildung und Arbeitsmarkt*. Wiesbaden: HLT Gesellschaft für Forschung Planung Entwicklung.

Ausländerbeauftragte. Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen (2000) *Daten und Fakten zur Auslandersituation*. Berlin: Ausländerbeauftragte.

Berend, N. (1998) *Sprachliche Anpassung. Eine soziolinguistisch-dialektologische Untersuchung zum Russlanddeutschen* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Gogolin, I. (1994) *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Munster/New York: Waxmann.

Gogolin, I., Neumann, U. and Reuter, L. (Hrsg.) (2000) *Schulbildung für Kinder aus Minderheiten in der BRD (1989-1999)*. Münster/New York: Waxmann (in print).

Gruner-Domic, S. (1999) Beschaftigung statt Ausbildung. Ausländische Arbeiterinnen und Arbeiter in der DDR (1961 bis 1989). In J. Motte, R. Ohliger and A. von Oswald *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik - 50 Jahre Einwanderung. Nachkriegsgeschichte als Migrationsgeschichte* (pp. 215-240). Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Hepsöyler, E. and Liebe-Harkort, K. (1991) *Muttersprache und Zweitsprache. Türkische Schulanfängerinnen und Schulanfänger in der Migration - Ein Vergleich*. Frankfurt am Main u.a.: Peter Lang.

Jørgensen, J. and Holmen, A. (1994) Sprogbrug hos tyrker i Danmark og Sverrig. In S. Boyd *et al.* (ed.) *Sprogbrug og sporgvalg blandt indvandrere i Norden. Bind 1: Gruppebeskrivelser*. København: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole.

Kruger-Potratz, M. (1991) *Anderssein gab es nicht. Ausländer und Minderheiten in der DDR*. Münster/New York: Waxmann.

Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung/Bezirksregierung Düsseldorf (Hrsg.) (1998a) *Wie Kinder miteinander und voneinander Sprachen lernen. Öffnung des Muttersprachlichen Unterrichts zur Förderung und Weiterentwicklung der Mehrsprachigkeit in Europa*. Bönen: Verlag für Schule und Weiterbildung.

Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung (1998b) *Wege zur Mehrsprachigkeit. Informationen zu Projekten des sprachlichen und interkulturellen Lernens 3*. Soest: Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung/im Selbstverlag.

Löfgren, H. (1991) *Elever med annat hemspråk än svenska*. Malmö: Lararhögskolan.

Landtag Nordrhein-Westfalen (1997) *Drucksache 12/2552 vom 10.11.1997 und Amtliche Schuldaten*.

Mehrländer, U., Ascheberg, C. and Ueltzhoffer, J. (1996) *Reprasentativuntersuchung 95: Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Berlin/Bonn/Mannheim: Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung.

Ministerium für Arbeit, Soziales und Stadtentwicklung, Kultur und Sport (2000) *Zuwanderungsbericht NRW*. Düsseldorf.

Pfaff, C. (1993) Turkish language development in Germany. In G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (eds) *Immigrant languages in Europe* (pp. 119-146). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Reich, H. and Hienz de Albentiis, M. (1998) Der Herkunftssprachenunterricht. Erlasslage und statistische Entwicklung in den alten Bundesländern. *Deutsch lernen* 1, 3-45.

Robbers, G. (1994) Ausländer im Verfassungsrecht. In E. Benda, W. Maihofer and H. Vogel (eds) *Handbuch des Verfassungsrechts der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (2. Aufl.) (pp. 391-424). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Schulte, A. (1998) *Multikulturelle Einwanderungsgesellschaften in Westeuropa: Soziale Konflikte und Integrationspolitiken*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Şen, F. and Goldberg, A. (1994) *Türken in Deutschland. Leben zwischen zwei Kulturen*. München: C.H. Beck.

Statistisches Bundesamt (1999) *Statistisches Jahrbuch für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1999*. Stuttgart: Metzler-Poeschel.

Tribalat, M. (1995) *Faire France. Une enquête sur les immigrés et leurs enfants*. Paris: La Découverte.